

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Official Action dated July 16, 2003. This amendment is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

Claim 1 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner noted three inconsistencies at lines 13, 19 and 20 of claim 1. Applicant has amended claim 1 to address the issues noted by the Examiner. No new matter has been entered because the correction at line 13 is supported by Figure 3 as well as page 9, lines 14-19 of the specification.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by admitted prior art. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

An object of this invention is to provide an anode cartridge of a testing device for electroplating, in which lines of electric force generated from an anode can enter uniformly into a plated side of a plated base. See page 4, lines 3-6.

A tabular second insulator, which has an opened hole that is the same shape to that of the plated departments, covers a side of the anode conductor that faces in a direction of the cathode cartridge. As a result, an exposure of the anode conductor is limited to only a part that is opposed to a shape of the plated departments. Thus, lines of electric force generated from a positive pole can enter uniformly into the plated departments of the plated base. Consequently, a uniform plating membrane is formed on the plated departments. See page 5, lines 18-25.

Since there is a second insulator, putting on and taking off is free for the first insulator or the anode conductor. See page 5, line 26, to page 6, line 1.

As for the anode cartridge 8, as shown in Figure 9, an anode conductor 9 of the anode cartridge 8 is exposed to only a part that is open hole 11a formed in a second insulator 11, to which the plated departments 2a of silicon wafer 2 opposed face to face. Therefore, lines of electric force generated from the anode conductor 9 and passed by the open hole 11a of the second insulator uniformly enter into the plating departments 2a. See page 14, lines 11-17.

The Examiner erroneously alleges that the fact that conductor 33, shown in Fig. 10 of the present application representing the prior art, is intended to be a cathode conductor instead of an anode conductor is irrelevant, since the polarity of an electrode is not a structural distinction.

Claim 2 recites the anode cartridge for electroplating of the testing device for electroplating of the present invention. It is well known to those skilled in the art of electroplating that the cathode cartridge in the testing device for electroplating includes a part to be electroplated, such as the plated base 32 in Fig. 10 or silicon wafer (plated base) 2 in Figs. 1-4. As illustrated in Figs. 8 and 9 and described in the pages 11-14 of the instant application and is generally well known to those skilled in the art of electroplating, during the electroplating process, the cathode and anode cartridges are placed into a plating solution within the plating tank in a spaced relationship relative to each other. The part to be plated is secured to the cathode cartridge. The plating solution contains positive ions such as copper ions, and the like. The source of D.C. current is connected to the terminals of the cathode and anode cartridges: positive pole to the anode cartridge and negative pole to the cathode cartridge. Therefore, lines of electric field extend from the anode cartridge to the cathode cartridge, thus transmitting the positive ions from the plating solution to the plated part of the plated base disposed in the cathode cartridge consequently electroplating the plated base.


Appl. No. 09/883,995
In re Yamamoto, W.
Reply to Office action of July 16, 2003

Therefore, the rejection of claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by the device shown in Fig. 10 of the present application is improper.

The Examiner indicated that claim 1 was allowable over the prior art and would be allowed if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 define the invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution, please contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted:
Liniak, Berenato & White

By: 
Matthew W. Stavish
Reg. No. 36,286

6550 Rock Spring Drive, Suite 240
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Tel. (301) 896-0600
Fax (301) 896-0607